## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

DAVID WALKER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS IN LIMINE

VS.

OREM CITY, et al.,

Defendants,

Case No. 2:02-CV-253 TS

Plaintiff, in its Amended Pretrial Disclosures<sup>1</sup> identify a number of exhibits it intendeds to offer at trial, including: a demonstrative computer generated diagram of the scene, a summary of officers called to chase/scene of shooting, and a demonstrative outline of David Walker's body. Defendant Clayton seeks to exclude these items pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 37(c) because Plaintiff failed to provide these items to them under Fed.R.Civ.P. 26.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Docket No. 207.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Summary of the Officers Called to the Chase/Scene, Docket No. 292; Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Demonstrative Outline of David Walker's Body, Docket No. 296; Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Demonstrative Computer Generated Diagram of Scene, Docket No. 323.

Plaintiff states that it does not intend to introduce a summary of the officers called to the chase/scene and does not intend to introduce a demonstrative computer generated diagram of the scene. Plaintiff has not objected to Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Demonstrative Outline of David Walker's Body.<sup>3</sup>

It is therefore

ORDERED that Defendants' Motions in Limine (Docket Nos. 292, 296, and 323) are GRANTED.

DATED October 5, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

TED STEWART

United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>DUCivR 7-1(d) ("Failure to respond timely to a motion may result in the court's granting the motion without further notice.")